



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

cr

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,239	09/29/2003	William H. Whitted	GOOGP013	9846
23689	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
Jung-hua Kuo Attorney At Law PO Box 3275 Los Altos, CA 94024			CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,239

Applicant(s)

WHITTED, WILLIAM H.

Examiner

Boris L. Chervinsky

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Wong.

Wu discloses a drive cooling baffle, comprising: a main body portion 2 defining and extending between an inlet opening 210 and an outlet opening 220, at least one of the openings is configured to cooperate with a fan 14 to cool at least one electronics component, the main body portion being configured to generally enclose the at least one electronics component; a flange 23 configured to be in contact with an electronics component base to which the drive cooling baffle, the fan, and the electronics component are attached. Wu discloses the claimed invention except the hook and loop material attached to the body portion to be engaged with hook and loop material of at least one of the fan or electronic component. Wong discloses the baffle assembly and the hook and loop material to attach the baffle assembly to other components. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the loop and hook material for attaching parts as disclosed by Wong in the structure disclosed by Wu for quick attachment and removal of various parts.

Details drawn to the hold down tab, the plastic material, cable openings and

Art Unit: 2835

indentations are well known in the art and not considered to be demonstrated as critical and therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use these elements in the device disclosed by Wu as well as to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

3. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Wong and further in view of MacManus et al.

Wu discloses the claimed invention as shown above except the conductive coating. MacManus discloses the baffle made of plastic with conductive coating. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use coated plastic as disclosed by MacManus in the device disclosed by Wu to reduce the weight of the design and provide thermal and/or electrical conductivity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Wu.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Tomioka et al.

Art Unit: 2835

Wu discloses the claimed invention except having inflow fan generating greater air movement than the inflow fan. Tomioka discloses the cooling device having the inflow and outflow fans, which provide greater inflow air movement than outflow fan. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use fans as disclosed by Tomioka in the device disclosed by Wu to provide more efficient use of power and adequate cooling.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 571-272-2039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BORIS CHERVINSKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Boris L. Chervinsky
9/20/14